UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,912	12/07/2006	Kenji Yamaguchi	278542014100	3804

25225   7590   03/16/2011
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 HIGH BLUFF DRIVE
SUITE 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2040

EXAMINER
MAGLOIRE, VLADIMIR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/16/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

EOfficeSD@mofo.com
PatentDocket@mofo.com
Drcaldwell@mofo.com

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-18 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-7, 12-14, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Martin et al (US 6,741,855 B1: hereinafter "Martin") in view of Karn

(US 2003/0147095 A1: hereinafter "Karn") further in view of Satoh (EP 0881587 A2:

hereinafter "Satoh", previously provided in prior office, therefore not provided in this

action, and not listed in PTO-892)

       Consider claim 1, Martin discloses a terminal device for transmitting and

receiving mails **(see Martin, fig. 3 item 330, fig. 1 item 112, Col 7 lines 24 to 26, Col

13 lines 7 to 10, discloses a terminal device for transmitting and receiving

emails)**, comprising:

       a mail receiving unit **(see Martin, fig. 3 item 318, Col 14 lines 41 to 67,

discloses a communication interface which is responsible for receiving and**

**transmitting data signals such as the received email commands sent in Col 3
lines 31 to 35, therefore a mail receiving unit**);

a judging unit **(see Martin, fig. 3 item 304, Col 13 lines 47 to 49)** to judge
whether a command declaration is included in a received mail **(see Martin, Col 9 lines
8 to 11, Col 11 lines 19 to 27, discloses "if the command message request that
headers be sent, the bot service will obtain the data necessary to retrieve the
requested commands", therefore the bot judges if the received email contains a
command message**);

a command interpreting unit **(see Martin, fig. 3 item 304, Col 13 lines 47 to 49)**
to extract and interpret a specific command following the command declaration if the
judgment of the judging unit is affirmative **(see Martin, Col 11, lines 1 to 12, lines 22
to 35, Col 7 lines 27 to 39, discloses a list of commands following command
declarations which specify specific functions, if the commands are included in
the email, therefore a command interpreting unit**);

a creating unit **(see Martin, fig. 3 item 304, Col 13 lines 47 to 49, Col 9 lines 8
to 13, discloses a list of email headers is created based on the number request by
the user, therefore a creating unit)** to, if the specific command is interpreted as target
list creation an instruction to create a list of one or more targets **(see Martin, Col 9
lines 8 to 13, discloses a list of headers is specified by the command message
and is created)**, which are specified by the specific command, create **(see Martin, Col
9 lines 8 to 14)**, from the targets stored in memory **(see Martin, fig. 3, items 306, 310)**
of the terminal device the list of the one or more targets which are specified by the

specific command **(see Martin, Col 9 lines 10 to 12, discloses the email headers are retrieved from the server "terminal device", based on the command "sendheaders: nn");**

a mail transmitting unit **(see Martin, fig. 3 item 304, Col 13 lines 47 to 49)** to create and transmit a mail having the created list as a mail body and addressed to a requestor **(see Martin, Col 9 lines 13 to 14, Col 11 lines 65 to 67, Col 12 lines 1 to 5, discloses returning the email header list to the requestor via email, therefore a mail transmitting unit);**

Martin discloses a time of retrieval of the email list **(see Martin, Col 9 lines 30 to 35, discloses "Mail Hdrs@11:53 AM").**

Martin fails to specifically disclose a received date with respect to each received mails is displayed in the list.

In the same field of endeavor, Karn discloses teaches a received date with respect to each received mails is displayed in the list.

Given that Martin discloses a retrieval timestamp and a list of calendar dates, therefore able to send dates of occurrences in a list, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Martin by including email received date, as taught by Karn, thereby providing a user with the ability to view and print emails (see Karn, paragraph [0005]).

The combination of Martin and Karn do not specifically disclose a processing unit to process the received mail as a regular mail if the judgment of the judging unit is negative.

In the same field of endeavor, Satoh discloses a processing unit to process the received mail as a regular mail if the judgment of the judging unit is negative **(see Satoh, fig. 9 steps 405 to 417, discloses determining if the received email contains any commands, if not then not executing commands, as in regular email)**.

Given that the combination of Martin and Karn discuss a server that stores emails and receives emails, and evaluates commands in emails, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Martin and Karn by processing the received mail as a regular mail if the judgment of the judging unit is negative, as disclosed by Satoh, thereby differentiating between command emails and normal emails.

Consider claim 2, the terminal device of claim 1, the combination Martin and Karn disclose authentication at the requesting device **(see Karn, fig. 3 step 104, paragraph [0015-16])** and authentication when modifying a bot profile **(see Martin, Col 8 lines 45 to 55),** and further discloses a comparing unit **(see Martin, Col 8 lines 45 to 55, discloses a user must enter a login password before any changes can occur, therefore a password is compared, therefore a comparing unit)**.

The combination of Martin and Karn fail to disclose if a password accompanies the command declaration and the judgment of the judging unit is affirmative, the password, and compare the password with a password owned by the terminal device;

and an authorizing unit operable to authorize the extraction and interpretation of the specific command if the passwords match each other.

In the same field of endeavor, Satoh teaches a comparing unit operable to detect, if a password accompanies the command declaration and the judgment of the judging unit is affirmative, the password, and compare the password with a password owned by the terminal device **(see Satoh, page 10 lines 39 to 45, discloses a password is sent along with the command email, the password is checked to verify a registered user, therefore the passwords are compared, and verified prior to open the email to check for commands)**; and an authorizing unit operable to authorize the extraction and interpretation of the specific command if the passwords match each other **(see Satoh, page 10 lines 39 to 47, discloses using the password to verify if a user is registered, if the user is authenticated then email is searched for command keywords)**.

Given that the combination of Martin and Karn each discloses processes of authentication, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination Martin and Karn by verifying a user password with the command email, as taught by Satoh, thereby providing a more secure system.

Consider claim 3, the terminal device of claim 1, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose wherein the command declaration is a unique character string different from a mail text **(see Martin, Col 7 lines 27 to 39, Col 11 lines 1 to 13, Col 12 lines 25 to 30, discloses unique character strings used for commands which the**

bot can differentiate from mail text), and the specific command is a line of code including a storage location of the targets **(see Martin, Col 3 line 44, discloses commands specify querying a database, therefore storage location)**, a type of the targets, and a process to be performed **(see Martin, Col 11 lines 1 to 12, discloses commands which specify types of targets and process to be performed)**.

Consider claim 4, the terminal device of claim 3, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose wherein the targets are received mails, transmitted mails, schedules of events, images, an address book, received voice calls, or transmitted voice calls **(see Martin, Col 3 lines 40 to 45, Col 7 lines 50 to 62, discloses targets maybe calendar events, stored emails, schedule of events)**.

Consider claim 5, the terminal device of claim 1, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose if a specific command transmitted by the requestor after the requestor checks the list of the mail is a request of transmitting a specific item in the list **(see Martin, fig. 5 steps 507 to 515, Col 11 lines 35 to 67, Col 12 lines 1 to 2, discloses a user sends a command and receives a list of email headers, then the user makes another request based on the reply message from the bot)**, the specific item is read from the memory, and a mail having the read specific item as a mail main body and addressed to the requestor is created and transmitted **(see Martin, fig. 5 steps 507 to 515, Col 11 lines 35 to 67, Col 12 lines 1 to 2, discloses a user sends a command and receives a list of email headers, then the user makes**

another request based on the reply message from the bot, the bot then retrieves the specified messages from the server and then a reply is sent back to the user with the results).

Consider claim 6, the terminal device of claim 1, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose wherein if a specific command transmitted by the requestor after the requestor checks the list of the mail is a request of deleting a specific item in the list, the specific item is deleted from the memory **(see Martin, Col 3 lines 40 to 42, Col 11 line 4, discloses sending a command to delete a particular mail from the server).**

Consider claim 7, the terminal device of claim 5, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose wherein a mail having a main body which indicates completion of the deletion and addressed to the requestor is created and transmitted **(see Martin, Col 6 lines 33 to 37, discloses "Upon completion of the requested task, bot service 108 transmits the reply message (e.g. via email) to mobile device which in turn displays the result to the user", prior to this lines 8 to 11, discloses the task that are commanded includes deletion, therefore mail having a main body which indicates completion of the deletion and addressed to the requestor is created and transmitted).**

Consider claim 12, the terminal device of claim 2, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose wherein the command declaration is a unique character string

different from a mail text **(see Martin, Col 7 lines 27 to 39, Col 11 lines 1 to 13, Col 12 lines 25 to 30, discloses unique character strings used for commands which the bot can differentiate from mail text)**, and the specific command is a line of code including a storage location of the targets **(see Martin, Col 3 line 44, discloses commands specify querying a database, therefore storage location)**, a type of the targets, and a process to be performed **(see Martin, Col 11 lines 1 to 12, discloses commands which specify types of targets and process to be performed)**.

Consider claim 13, the terminal device of claim 12, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose wherein: the targets are received mails, transmitted mails, schedules of events, images, an address book, received voice calls, or transmitted voice calls **(see Martin, Col 3 lines 40 to 45, Col 7 lines 50 to 62, discloses targets maybe calendar events, stored emails, schedule of events)**.

Consider claim 14, the terminal device of Claim 1, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh wherein the list of the one or more targets is created by selecting a predetermined number of the targets, in order of most recently received **(see Martin, Col 4 lines 64 to 66, discloses sending a command to retrieve the last 25 electronic mail documents that reside on the server, therefore most recently received)**.

Consider claim 17, the terminal device of Claim 1, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose wherein the number of the one or more targets in the list is a predetermined number that has been specified **(see Martin, Col 9 lines 24 to 25, where "nn" and "n" represent a predetermined number of targets)**.

Consider claim 18, the terminal device of Claim 1, Martin discloses, wherein if the targets are received mails, at least a sender **(see Martin, Col 11 lines 45 to 50, discloses listing the sender)**, is displayed in the list with respect to each of the received mails.

The combination of Martin and Satoh do not specifically disclose a received date and a subject are displayed in the list.

Karn discloses disclose a received date **(see Karn, fig. 2 "date")**, and a subject are displayed in the list **(see Karn, fig. 2 "subject")**.

4.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Karn and Satoh further in view of Farnham et al (US 2003/0158855 A1: hereinafter "Farnham").

Consider claim 9, the terminal device of claim 1, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose wherein if the targets are schedules of events, a date, a time, with respect to each of the schedules of events **(see Martin, Col 3 lines 44 to 45, Col 9 lines 15 to 22, discloses targets are calendar events and date and time are requested)**.

The combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh do not specifically disclose an icon indicating a type of an event are displayed in the list.

Farnham discloses an icon indicating a type of an event are displayed in the list **(see Farnham, paragraph [0158], discloses using symbols to indicate a type of event on a calendar "list" sent to a user).**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh by having an icon indicating a type of an event displayed in a list, as taught by Farnham, thereby providing quick reference to the type of event scheduled.

5.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Karn and Satoh further in view of Hatakama et al (US 2002/0147661 A1: hereinafter "Hatakama").

Consider claim 10, the terminal device of claim 1, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh do not specifically disclose wherein if the targets are images, a shooting date, a title, an address in which an image is stored are displayed in the list, with respect to each of the images.

In the same field of endeavor, Hatakama discloses if the targets are images, a shooting date, a title, an address in which an image is stored are displayed in the list, with respect to each of the images **(see Hatakama, fig. 13 "Picture ID" denotes location of image, "Type" denotes the title of the picture, "Date" denotes the shooting date, fig. 12 steps s41-s45, fig. 14 steps s51-s54, discloses a user**

**request a listing page and the network returns a list of pictures with a shooting
date, title and address in which an image is stored)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to modify the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh by sending a listing of
images, with shooting date, title and image location, as taught by Hatakama, thereby
providing an easier manner of previewing and purchasing images (see Hatakama,
paragraph [0010-0011]).

6.   Claims 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Martin, Karn and Satoh further in view of Theimer (US 6,519,241 B1: hereinafter
"Theimer").

Consider claim 11, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose the
terminal device of claim 1, being a server on the internet.

The combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh do not specifically disclose the
terminal device is mobile phone.

In the same field of endeavor, Theimer discloses a mobile phone with the
functionality of a web server **(see Theimer, Abstract, Col 3 lines 31 to 43, discloses a
mobile phone acting as a web server).**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to modify the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh by using a mobile phone
as the server, as taught by Theimer, thereby creating a more mobile and flexible
system.

Consider claim 16, the combination of Martin, Karn, Satoh and Theimer disclose the terminal device of claim 11, further comprising: a display unit to display data stored in the memory **(see Martin, fig. 3 discloses display 312 coupled to memories 306, 308, 310 via Bus 302, therefore to display data stored in the memory)**.

7.   Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Karn and Satoh further in view of Rouse et al (US 6,757,530 B2: hereinafter "Rouse").

Consider claim 15, the terminal device of claim 1, the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh disclose targets are received emails.

The combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh fail to specifically disclose wherein if the targets are the received mails, unread mails are included in the list and read mails are not included in the list.

In the same field of endeavor, Rouse discloses if the targets are the received mails, unread mails are included in the list and read mails are not included in the list **(see Rouse, Col 6 lines 15 to 25, Col 10 lines 38 to 56, discloses a user sends a request to view a list of unread emails which is then displayed on the users phone via the internet)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Martin, Karn and Satoh by sending a list only of unread emails, as taught by Rouse, thereby providing a user with quick access to unviewed mail.

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.   Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.   See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VLADIMIR MAGLOIRE whose telephone number is (571)270-5144. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro can be reached on 571-272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.   Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vladimir Magloire/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617 3/7/11

/KAMRAN AFSHAR/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617